

1-07

Hyp: In conjunction with attack on Iran  
& Israel?

by US, after Israeli attack on  
Iran, brooking Iranian attack on US ships?!

2-12-07 Tuesday

Iran - nukes

True for moral courage: ~~mis-tak~~; strategic action  
For what would you risk your life?

Crisis - before Nov 2008 / Jan 09 your career? Congress/  
(g. soldiers in Iraq) CLEARANCE Exps

- the ranks - split moral decisions;

rest of us - of our - the bodies, genitals

- orders

(we) went not fail to To restore it

- torture

do enough we can - NV,

your manor?

truthfully (truth-tellings)

children's education

mis-tak - to keep buy

(Dundalk - won't risk

THIS PRES, VP, THIS ADMIN

royalties

FROM - DOING WRT IRAN

(Has he told Congress - in

WHAT HE DID WRT IRAQ,

closed session?

LAST 2001, 02, 03, 04,

Intell Committee?

05, 06,

Rockefeller?

- not big collateral damage

(Risk pros - for torturing, in ticky tack situations

Dear Stop War:

Congress

Harris

UK - Labor - Blair

Church (vs. Bush)

China

(vs. Iraq; Iran no threat)

NATO

WBs

Impress (Chen)

What will / do you do to avert Iran attack?

[Problem: to rule out attack, even oppose it,  
[ "in next 5-10 years: no crisis"]  
without "undermining negot - i.e. l

(what makes it a crisis:

"Bush & Cheney are moderate enough,  
bold enough  
to carry out an insane, criminal move

[ "Have not to deal with proliferation"

[Bush: public is prof. to bad guys —  
this is the way."

Ash Carter, Perry (Clinton-Kore)

X

[How snuck out — make public — internal  
opposition by Gates + Rice (= Khalil + Rogers!)  
Nasby? Poer?  
How get VCS to testify?

CFR

(GELB) (Haas! Winston Lord!

Koppel?

[What if Cheney had been killed in Kabul?]

| What worked with NK is much more  
troubling with Iran,

Non-existence of agent. <sup>progen</sup> ~~probes~~ can be  
demonstrated — give injection, measure

Dog inspection did work.

2-17-7

Will Dens challenge trial or from?

Close of juvenile

Monday  
Hyp: 2-19-07 5:30 PM

then attack as a provocation (<sup>initially</sup> (non-nuc))  
to draw response

justifying COG

(strategy of "tension")

Fear will comes after an attack!

(Asia first on Iran!)

(Initial attack might be "surgical")

2-22-7

Santos (you can consult for article)

The present is simply lying

"We are not planning

("do not intend...")

Possible opponents:

fug Rockhoff

out of frug Cool?

Webb

segons of de Fazio

Gore?

farms hills

Constituents

Ballot:

ECK?

farms

Edwards?

de Fazio (Peter?)

Lee?

Woolsey?

More On?

Kingman, Dement, Herbert, Knutty

NYT ad?

VIPS

UK?

"WB's" — Odom, Wilson, Pillar, Claude

~

generals

Gen Karadim

UPJ?

Giraldi

Drug Study Group: Baker

LEAK NIE

2-22-07

will an attack on Iran

make America safe? OR

solve American issues (in Iraq) OR --

Rumsy 2-22-07

Edwards: greatest mind that is Israeli attack  
on Iran

Pelletier re. attack: Move On; Wesley Clark / IVAW,  
Peace Action

Hillary 2-14: Must have Congressional auth.  
(if not - impeach?!)

London Times 2-23-07

Sixties anti to Holes: might approach if attack.

Opposal of Holes (!), Rice (!) (See Df/Seabrook  
Hally?) = Nixon, VN!

backed of Cheney (+ Bush)

(see N/NAE (+

2-22-07

Blair appears

Fengold as cutty funds

Ergy

Bob Gorl (coll)

Pillar

[Re-activate Congress!]

Solomon - that Perry to recruit others!

Bevin: Court crisis over Iran

Webb

Stegel

Rice

(Haven, Pro need for  
a TG incident)

(see Webb on  
potential in Persian Gulf)

A PERSIAN GULF INCIDENT, is in our future?

(1st attack provoked (34A-type action warning!))

2nd "attack" — "mis-interpreted"

(see shooting of Iranian airliner)

c-mail

2-24-07

"problem of Dem candidates on Show/Read

PDA

Kucinich

Wes Clark

Howard

Friggstad

2-25-

W&H (Rusk) always saw prob as  
inevitable

(given US/NWS position + use?)

Were they wrong?

Rooted to adapt to this?

Feb 10

Paul Guy Roberts: We're looking for Poland (after  
Czechoslovakia, Prague) without being a post-  
Reichstag Free police state

Want a Treaty Act

(signing statements)

= few of them  
+ war

Reasons for refusing for anything unless  
by improving all other conditions, if by  
were faithful to the oaths [or officials]  
B+C (+R) would have been improved.

Roberts: Ult. + committed  
to B-C - if attack or un-improvement

[Coy. does no sign treaty, creates  
obligation, responsibility, then to  
invade

remove B+C

remove weapons: not last

wilt. or  
unfriendly } stop war in Iraq (else?)  
} and others on them.

Feb 3

Perry: Should Bush be behind this treaty,  
which he says he wants a dip. solution  
in Iran. Or that threat of a war bomb is  
next 2 years — even Bush — is doing (dumb  
and) US policy now??

way as "last  
resort"

in 2001-03:

2-28-07

or - ever now, when we — became later (+ wait for the market, or benefit):

Sales pitch for ever produced by WH  
covered & press

Pro-  
(was propaganda  
jingoism)

An ad/PR campaign is wasteful  
("It's not August")

Promised 1) USG chose policy as alternative  
is "off the table"  
irreversible

by law — unattractive/inversible (politically)  
("less desirable, overall"  
— the war  
prob  
we won?!

2) Now you have me (+ Bush?)  
irreversible

date, not.

(right/prob. would not go to  
war at all.)

Would Gore, King, Clinton have gone to  
war on Bush? or Bush I? Dole?  
(Kleinman - yes; Israeli option on Clinton/Gore?)

(If Bush I were running against  
Bush II, I'd work as hard as for King or Gore)

"NEGOT" BY THREAT

rains legit. b) Talk of "all options" (uses; aggression)  
measures for laws  
but threatened for  
consequences at that.  
- does anti-prob, is pro-prob (+ pro-use)  
- is an attack on int'l. law

NK is using  
its weapons

already:

(to the good!)

defines Wayne State

(no force)

is one document on the  
table for force?

So - should have got uses?  
(Wolfe)

Non-aggression pact? Settlement?

2-25-07

## Stop from

Resignation is not enough — before or after  
attack.

Ann. <sup>and</sup> looks without does — not enough.

Closed testing to Intel Com. — not enough.

Ann. briefs?

open testing?

Advises to fabricate

Does to anti-attack Congresspersons

Pressure on VCS to — offer formally  
— testify to Congress

DOCS

Warnings of Persian Gulf threats (Res.)

Kibul press agency: Attack

Frankly attack / Shinseki — Leon? Stressord?

Campaign contributors:

Alan Gray? (Pelosi)  
Obama

but Congress loose!  
Edwards

Cong: Focus on Iran

not Kuwait, DeGioia, co-sponsors behind her bill

Other? warning of impeachment (51<sup>st</sup>)

Can a Repub sue, to neutralize him?!!

Lieberman factor? Can he half control these issues?  
so his threat without ties to him?!

To generals used to resign:

If that: responsibility is to do your best  
to stop it

truthfully & NV  
expose it  
oppose it openly

These are obligations we have not to do this

But PRESERVING YOUR OWN CAREER SHOULD  
NOT BE ONE OF THEM.

Crisis as defined by: <sup>demands</sup> willingness to sacrifice careers,  
we need (Profils in) Concile <sup>of life</sup>

This can't wait till 2009:

(or, election year, 2008)

see  
moral  
Byrd  
(23 J. Shrag  
133

[ Could Israel be presented:

2. to accept Holocaust - like Klaonnei!
1. To clarify/withdraw of threat to Israel
3. Obama factors against us: <sup>distress</sup>

[ Hyp: tonight "rants of subsidy" from Ann to Shrag  
(Kerry) is to prevent American support to  
Shim Elbit (or Lani!) after US attack  
on Sarafli

(cf. Shraward's "ethical dilemmas" - wrt forward sacrifice

To generals used to resign:

If that: responsibility is to do your best  
to stop it

truthfully & NV  
expose it  
oppose it openly

These are obligations we must do this

But PRESERVING YOUR OWN CAREER SHOULD  
NOT BE ONE OF THEM.

Crisis as defined by: <sup>demands</sup> willingness to sacrifice careers,  
we need (Profils in) Courage <sup>official</sup>

This can't wait till 2009!

(or, election year, 2008)

See  
moral  
Byrd  
(23 v. Iraq)  
133

[ Could Israel be permitted:

2. to accept Holot - like Khamenei!
1. To clarify / withdraw of threat to Israel
3. Obama backs against me! <sup>decides</sup>

[ Hypo: tonight "rants of suffice" from Ann to Tony  
(Kerry) is to prevent Brown support to  
Shtur Affs (or Lani!) after US attack  
on Sarafli

(cf. Annas "ethical dilemmas" — w/ forward sacrifice

2-25-07

Walter Lumbis says: We can't attack after  
enrichment has proceeded en masse,  
because of retroactivity?

What does it take to prevent an ME +  
new proof and reac? <sup>inv. from (Troyan)</sup>  
without an attack on Iran  
Art. VI (stop violating it)

BT  
Reg

	Sunday:	JAMAIC	(so far 3-17?)
Cahn	B folders	Kang	
<u>Cabosso</u>		\$1m/forwa	Monday:
(PDS)	Common Drives	bombs	Hibby
	Salon		UN Sec. Council
	Heesh	UK Papers	
(Hoffman)	NYT		Ritter
Mankiewicz	throughout	Iran Coll	Rosen
Knight	Perry		Ewerett
	morning shows		farnsworth
	AC/L	Sam Smith	Alex Konte
	Customs		Pawela

2-26-07

(Hence) Is US provoking semi-Shia  
spirit - in Iraq

in region, world - to isolate them,  
weaken - cover region does  
spill off Khayyastan?

and trying to provoke them  
- to attack us

and/or - to attack Iraq

They get full support in Congress  
(and CZ (Clinton government) has long, all-  
out war

Syria  
Lebanon

What if: Is. regime in Pak?

We progress in Gulf, Saudis, Egypt?

After attack (e.g. we attack) a few -

? Russia + China - now them  
- strengthen them  
- help with our progress  
- GIVE NGOs

(now? to front  
attack? :

2-25-07

by:

- How sure is he Israel went intiate the war — or "think" to, "form" US position

(as if we can't stop them?)

CAN we? Can Say yes / or not?

"What would an Israeli attack mean for US air to Israel?"

Hag airspace?

Pobby of Mabiki gave an use of Hagzi airspace?

Or bans in Hag?

Relations with US give — warning?

Ask Marti: Even gave a US I-T power  
in bans in Hag.

Want of them?

Does US expire demand attack or them?

Control it separately from banks?

Israel?

or "want" that be prescribed?

(us. China)

2-26-7

What is danger to US (interests?)  
of a nuclear Iran?

How will it affect its (increased)  
remit/influence?

to what ends, effect?

How would it threaten Israel?

(greater support to Hizbullah (10%)  
and Hamas?)

What about our friends?

Egypt?

Should HAG/RWS/(McN? 68)/N vision  
of inevitable conflict be accepted—  
or ...?

(Practices now against all <sup>potential</sup> hostiles  
(except Russia & China!) |  
Pak?

(Argentina?

Brazil?

UK?

Turkey?

\$

Can "hostiles" be promoted <sup>over gets no</sup> when/if anyone  
else does the?

Will Iran be tipping point?

(So, was not  
or, India / Pak)

(Who and Iran "threats")?

Centrist Iranian STEP BACK? (NK)

Admiring talk of Holocaust + "irony"  
that (a refugee) he was unwilling  
to count definitely:

use, recogn. Israel's right to  
exist" or exceeding V (Hamas)

(W) does he support (semi) Hamas?

Can it stop? (2003 offer)

accept/recogn. Israel in '67 borders  
(vs. Hamas) (fbn)

Constit. Khomani assert his (actual)  
central of foreign/pac. policy:  
depose or straight out  
Admst. ?!

Can't have bid without "pac option"  
in S-T. ?

2-28-07

Iran should not (be allowed?) get nuclear weapons. (Ritter: throw out inspectors)

How prevent this?

us. Ritter not by attack.

2) bilateral negotiations (in NK?)

(b) De-legitimize (if not, "criminalize") nukes; global prohibition on profif. and intention of nukes —

(do we leave NK with nukes?)

Pak? Russia

steady, fast, unprovoked mount towards  
0!

Each use immediately: now, us. from  
USA

(If threats don't end soon, without  
war, game against profif is hopeless,  
is short-run.

(Yes, if Iran gets nukes — in 3-8 years —  
war game against profif is hopeless;  
but attack spreads that day ...)

"when Iran gets nukes, or is attacked, profif  
is unstoppable" → whichever comes first

(+ I would say — if present USG threats/ver  
continue to be credibility — a year, a month...?)

tie up "counter-prolif" (Carter/Perry (1993)  
Korea, + policy)  
Libya  
see Oding — NOT a success.

2-28-07

Did Osius attack slow, or speed up,  
frag program?

Would SH have been as close to a break  
as he was in 1990, without Osius?

see N am think to him, 1971

"Should" Nesson have attended Davos in 1967?!

World that have changed so much, as of 1993?

Trident program: how will it go?

(see FD debate in ~~thinking~~: 1999?)

If we hold off attack on Iran (and this also, we attack)  
till Jan 08

we will buy still more time to reverse  
course

If we don't block attack under Bush,  
we will ("probably") "even" reverse course  
(even if our inperial ambitions collapse  
economically — fascism — we won't  
democracize — or democratize)

— see Russia!

(at "best" we'll become  
like Russia today — or, a  
modern and France/Pisacane/  
Brazil/Argentina/Chilean  
(Salazar) regime

Cabresso: There are motives in addition to option  
for we weapons to have inc. enrichment caps:  
that apply to ~~Iran~~<sup>\*</sup>, Japan<sup>†</sup>, Brazil<sup>‡</sup> & Netherlands  
and Peru 5

(and Argentina, Australia, South Africa)

and in addition to the own energy needs

(<sup>\*</sup> who also want we option!) (Iran is "about and" one of  
the others applying for enrichment plant)  
obliged to expand after  
see list of reasons.  
the three.

(What of India, Saudi, NK, Bd, NK? ~~other~~ has  
the most (?) have such caps, see Peru 5 –  
not only for weapons!)

To Ritter: if goal is <sup>(and)</sup> regime change – how will attack  
do that?

(To MHH + SH – is there any hit that Bush still  
believes this? If not...?)

My hgs: also – provide for veto, which gives  
us: Expo dictatorship, detention  
and draft (apart from blacks, too?  
Confederacy: separation;  
and race testing racial  
profiling...)

- A. (We will be in Iraq in Jan 2009 (and beyond))  
B. But we might not have attacked them. If we didn't  
(after we invade Iran + Syria: where else?)

using  
the ones?

(ADM)

(after Iran wins  
missiles...)

Pakistan?

Does Russia fight back in Crimea? Cospi...

Colombia? Venezuela?

B8

Did Israel have "the right" to establish a Jewish State in Pal., not expel Pals and refuse to allow them to return?

(Did European settlers have "the right" to exterminate Indians and take the land?)


(Mexican War?)

Louisiana / Alaska Purchase: yes,

(+ + +)

Do revolutionaries have a "right" of armed resistance?

Terror? (I would say, No — no one does)



2-28-07

To Hersh's article being acted on immediately in Congress?

By other reporters?

In other actions? (poorer)



Hossein int. 2-28-07

Pats: How got leaving in Hersh/Ritter/

Priorty: from

(intelligence if ....) — and a law, a Political document

(stops count actions? 34A, Hersh...)

(Which of them are intended to provide an attack on an ships? 34A-type?!

Maryam:

Debtors' patrols?!

I

(not priority: dependent (yet))

- from Stray

(Dems don't want a vote in defining way:

down the control vote?

or, borders oppose, one of them could win?

(prob. both: 1st sufficient)

- that serves a Ritter, Hersh assertives, as well as analysis (totally? lead to Congress?)

NIE? to Congress? (from ...?)

\* copied testing from Reproductive, on Hersh statements on Iran from Bush trip?

Krueger? that "HAK Trip" to oppose IRAN?

(ad. Odom; Scanerfelt; Fry;

2-28-07

- Bring out and support local (of Cong action)  
of "from down" in Adm vs. Chen, Bush & Abrams:  
Gates (!) Rice (?) Hodel? (Pawell?)  
Witkus, Pillar (misct?) Miltz: Ang/Moss

VTPs

[see Silence of the Doves in VN  
and they

Now?

Lesson of VN: 1964-65

67

Korib-Rogers!

NSC-5

Promotions:

Northwards  
mongoose } do bats?  
34A }

Cuba-I

Oct 1964 - JTM, WPB

(Reagan)

done by a done

No, I don't think we did 9-11.

But we did

not kill them, or just gave him:

Feb 1965

see me, in Feb 1965!

gave  
S+H  
Ritter.  
Pat. People think, attack on them is a bad  
idea, not that's like the surge:  
not that it's apocalyptic

(They did not attack on US/Israel, any more  
than the VCs did it cannot be occupied, even  
"hell VN or they" (or Bermuda, Panama) (Nicaragua)

If SH is right

the they are planning to provoke an attack by SVN or OSL

as in Buna-Bien 0-2

1964-65...

WE NEED "DSM" NOW Clarke, etc. now

Clarke  
Spout at.  
Scheuer?

- JFK - Oct 1 1962 did not descend, or "planned, intended" to invade Cuba by Oct 20 - but wanted to have 24-hr option (see now, at least)

(N real descent? on Nov 3, 62 - but backed off.)

From units option

(may be before intel)

(Robbie: much more dangerous to attack than drag (and that can't have been much worse! CW, Baghdad... Sarajevo...)

as JCS wanted If Admin wants not wants a draft - they want mobilization (mobil.) attacks by SVN or AQ...

Wants BUT - demands of energy/oil don't control attack in SVN - see attack of Hats + Rins <sup>Any</sup> / down on VN drag...)

If other opponents were in - Dev, Robbie - they wouldn't be taking these sides

So there resistance to a draft as strong as G8's resistance to mobilization?

Cobraso/

to have 1 - something

- How long does it take from the time IAEA inspectors are kicked out, until higher enrichment begins?
- If Iran has bombs, it can run up <sup>+ Haros</sup> N.Y. vs. Israel more,
  - without fear that if Israel responds on Iran,
  - or Iran responds on Israel (non-reciprocal)
  - that Israel will attack with nukes
  - (trumps, now)
  - or another administration may move...

(Iran uses centralized tanks of FC, and  
of major non-reciprocal attacks  
(from US, Isr.; Pak?  
don't expect (?) relations with Saudis,  
Egypt...))

If disputes can be settled, of negot with  
Iran, or Isr./Pak, and Russia/Syria-Isr....

---

Warren NYT publishing ST pieces - several  
as they are? (and with this content?)

Wash Post?

Why is he not on network TV?

Why by Garrison?

ST on Ken Stewart

Draw on / PSR (sol)

What to do?

Anneigungs (sol ...) (sol)

Cuts-off more than  
depressible (?)

Carbasso kept imports in from  
Kroon get "slammer"

(not ...)

By an M&M when

Dos  
US public

3-3-7 Ruth: To get what "we" (not Adm) want  
without making any concessions that the  
Adm won't give (in contrast to NK)

Get the changes in  
Bush negot. policy before  
Iran gets weapons, or  
before/without a war.

You need a threat of war.

You need to intend that a war <sup>[when?]</sup> would  
be a) legit, and b) necessary, and c)  
better than either making concessions  
or "allowing" Iran to get ones (in 3-8 years)

Implicitly, Dos accept war.

Iran will be a threat to our troops in  
another country (Iraq) and to US, and to  
Israel (as Iraq never was) after we  
attack; it is not today, nor long in future  
before an attack (in months, 3-8 years  
from now; or not so much - to do - as after an attack).  
+ to civil

me

@ lampadius, 2/26

Kirk implores us to (while NK! or Iraq, 1998!)

This is a challenge to US legitimacy  
+ the oil-rich ME

(no GP - legitimacy isn't equally  
important)

See

AJR #70?

AJR 14 (Jones)

March 3

✓ 1. We cannot be an inheritor against hostile or  
use who we are using our weapons

as we are now, with exception of  
Cypres

(Has Cypres ever participated in open  
bombs before?  
editorials?)

✓ 2. We (Prs, Cypres, —) are promoting brief  
use of our war now

(and to our own use of our  
conventional forces —

(dual-purpose forces))

and by

✓ 3. The motion, "all options — i.e. are options —  
are on the table"

{not ~~on~~ ~~on~~ for them!}

But NK, yes? . . .

(What if removes its nucl. options  
on the table?)

(and note — we've removed the conventional  
option from our negotiations with NK? (or Pak))

The contrast, note of all, further  
promotes brief:

(Does remove first its war "creators" — for  
anything but no war to one attack? Pak?  
China? (Even UK? (see was listed by

o Colossal, for current;  
these all apply to a new policy program,  
plus...

What Congress wants pretty much the same —  
~~what~~ what the Admin wants — is a presently  
initiated formation or another war.

That is the most "effected" aspect that,  
when the Pres is (as usual, but not necessarily)  
more and more likely to carry it out  
(although, doesn't it) than Congress

esp. when the Pres. can use the "war  
they" — which is now, as never before.

(Can it be that Bush and his aids  
are not aware of the power, the  
beginning value, of the unstructured,  
uninformed — and well-formed — usage of his  
(+ Cheney: "the bad cop and the worse  
cop.")

Cong. cannot go on step further in  
strengthening Bush's bargaining power: they  
cannot do what they did in Oct 02  
[not even now — e.g. in Military Comm Art.]  
and for some explicit reasons (which  
Haley is still discussing):

Delegate this power to the Pres explicitly,  
(against the Court) open-ended in time and scope

3-3-7

✓ Why do what they are doing, verbally not  
not do that — "for both bargaining" ?!

✓ If that's too dangerous and irresponsible, in the  
eyes of the constituents + on allies

(another TGR)

○ Can UK prevent do what Cong. can do —  
the opposite?

What coalition partners would we have  
this time?

○ (The new "new Europe"?

Which not? as new ones?  
Israel?

Turkey? (Will Saudi? Egypt? Air bases,  
Qatar, Kuwait; Sunnis vs. Shi'a? What response will there  
be next?)

(or maybe, on the other hand, NATO is  
cooperative, already)

Will the help promote democracy in states and  
us? or with greater repression, or civil strife?

a Pak/Taliban regime, one - and?

"Delicate balance": Spain: Pak? What do we do then?

Effort on an elongate?

a we regime my "tilt" to AQ!

What if Saudis? (not one - yet!)

Shia in SA, next to Iraq?

Do we want Saudis to get Bomb — after we attack

Iran? Egypt? allies to Israel THEN?!

3-3-7

(not in Christian file)

O

Chung: He <sup>the</sup> would understand if Somalis went abroad?

O

(Does this fit with SH report?)

Why does he oppose this? We get cows without burns?

Why not a TS incident: a normal Somali attack? moth Oring? PROVOKE them.

Or, what by von Krueger (our) airforce?

Can they respond on the cows?

O

[If the goes (or a attack in fog (to US) is blamed on them -

First went "and" say admitted, even with a Bill.]

O

[to PDS - How can he - or other 9-11 - even doubt Africa will not attempt to run another "false flag" op (or, catalytic war) with/as usual, and get away with it? (and expect to).]

(esp. after their real -

not expected, or expected, with drug attack - or more than VN.)

except SU  
Central-IT,  
Burm

This is first target that can do that - see other cases and situations: VN, Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, [Kings dist?] Panama, [Abu Dhabi dist] in UK - and domestic flights]

more em

<sup>True</sup>  
A program : to move Pre-initiated  
attack — command or one — from  
the table

And please we are attack on any  
non-war cont NSA

(BW? CW? :)

O Where is Russia on this? Not as small  
at NWs?  
not farml? ]

for, this weakens the Northern Front

V (it didn't move it — even with the open cupboard

-one wijng startent? (not, vets?)

V by Pans; TG

"We do it."

But the reasons for doing it are:

1) The PMS help are most,

This jointly should not be treated

it as more than the assertion.

2) There is strong evidence of tritium

Start - 00 - 2002 - B+C do not intend

expect or want a negotiated solution

but our attack at various days —

and believe that - mostly - that is attack

will give the a favorable sign cheap

③ Pressure is not (?) big to work a firm.

✓ ~~The~~ They are not bluffing with the threats —  
it is the "dissidence" that is a bluff.

(Not me, for Reel, or Gots; but see Powell.  
(David & Reyes!)

Cong. should not vote a new delegation:

It should never be Congressionally - pre-delegated, preventively - instead very  
"from the tables."

(Hypothetically, it is within a Cong-  
authorized threat on the tables

(NUC? No!)

\* would say not — because of  
effect now on probif and use of others  
(and the own "members", w/ot Powell)

But they would have to know the  
own stance to use it — which \* would  
study power.

See interview of student of Perry  
(friend of Kinsley) et al —

unless if there is an attack;  
at pretty unless if the support  
and threats

(as each of the has done in  
part: Perry/Libya...)

3-3-07

Contine:

There is a world opinion / view on this —  
which we are violating.

Press The convergence of our weapons, peaceful  
scars:  
(NPK, Iraq, Iran)

surprise: Bush/Pot tests

Iraq 90-91 (clean the house)

NK track

SC strength

and terrorism (in US) (delayed)

and bring down democracy

(bound to come: with HAG/N others  
and USC policies)

Next: 8-3-07

Our ultimatum to SA ad to Park  
is b/c (at our request)

SA + Park ultimatum to AQ

(a, to clients in the securities that  
are friendly to AQ):

We support regime that includes clients  
who support AQ clients.

SA regime does this (PDS) the very business  
support Mayor in Chicago: as "protection money".  
~~to~~ (in exchange to threats? or) to keep scrutiny  
directed at others (us:)

We support SA regime <sup>(?)</sup> to keep the threats  
permanently with us? to keep the same  
clients from mounting the ad threats  
better than they attack "us":  
us, instead:  
independent of USG/comps.

However, we support Park regime but it  
be independent of the clients that (hate us but)  
support AQ clients

Neira

8-3-21

Our motion to ~~SA ad to Park~~  
<sup>Sends</sup>  
is bill (at our request)

SA + Park motion to AG

(X)

(a), to clients in the securities that  
are friendly to AG:

We support Neira that we will clients  
who support AG clients.

SA again does the (POS) the very business  
support Mayor in Chicago: as "protection money"  
~~to~~ (in response to threats? or) to keep hostile  
clients at others (us!)

We support SA again<sup>(?)</sup> to keep the clients  
friendly with us? to keep the same  
clients from mounting the ad trading  
"letter that try attack "us":  
US, instead:  
independently of USG/combo.

Distance, we support Park Neira but it  
be independent of the clients that (hate us and)  
support AG clients

3-4-7

△

Ment Help  
Lagisator

sign-on letter

Brotha answered he

2 weeks ago

stopped talking

Open Society Policy Center  
Defense Approach.

Meet-up bill

Prepared on H

I

Nicke Amity

Mitch Amity 7 PM Sunday 3-4-7

Keeping sun provision as a bargaining chip - say, "he is considering..."

Pelosi would support sun provision if it was in the bill...

No one would confirm

no one will say it will stay in the bill...

one-line

Murtha + Pelosi's considering nothing in  
Feb 14, AP story

Dale Obey a committee  
Tuesday

OSP (501(c)4)

gathering Tuesday

Aus Control Cmttee e-mail list  
Dear Condition

Mike Sheedy <sup>ass't to?</sup> - has been cog - don't  
count on its next

March 8th - work-up Thurs.

Sevete 2 weeks later  
Name: limit amount

Webb, Peery, ELC, Byrd

Klaus

What would consequences be for US soc  
and "image" if USG let go of tanks  
in Iraq, and Iran did not mess, or was  
indeed not to,  
but no attack on  
Ayatollah...  
External relations;  
How?]

US stopped effort to control oil? since

What US elites are prepared to accept this?  
Public?

But - what benefits does Bush/McCain get from  
(new) attack on Iran?

Answers are one "simply" want to back up <sup>Santos, Pak</sup> Sauris -  
nobody Al Qaeda! - us, Syria, as in  
1980 (Carter vs. SO is off, Iraq as.. then...  
with AQ  
1990

Stop Iran attack: try to move to Abolition  
(see HAK group) as answer to proxy  
and for restoring a republic.

"To the Republic." (good republic?)

Notes ed, Feb 5 (Schell?)

(needs better analysis of VN/N - Iraq)

Investigate, research, cut funds  
(send out of troops?)

Fahedi

3-10-7

From "Sunset"  
3-10-7

McCain: "Only thing worse than war with  
Iran [or a "coup"] is a 'a we-and you'.  
↓

~~as~~ Hilly agrees!

No problem will remain after Bush

Tsely

4 M/day - consumes 2 M/day.

Prod. has doubled in past 27 years;  
seems, Iran will have no oil for export.

Same to prove we energy.

Strat. incentive: are neighbors

friendly encircled of US (Afroz, Afghan, former SU  
Caspian region)

(Is it the "Persian" Gulf or "Armenian Gulf"  
— or American lake?

US open air of Afghan change

Park: real numbers go to Tehran.

They are interested in building infrastructure  
to have a coup

a detent — [but this means wars, not "coup"]

Ruby circles:

"want to be able to prompt a pre-emptive  
attack" (oh, oh; dangerous.)

If same: what happened to SH, what did not  
happen to Kim Jong-il.

(but Khamenei — fatawa?)

Al Akra Rock — where Mohammad ascended to heaven

(book? research?)

I Iran has any legal right for enrichment —  
but is it wise to press for this now, even  
under IAEA inspection

(A offhand shot — Beger, Mutharob, CAFEI, Boradani

Iran is now more assertive than Saudis (Egypt? Jordan?  
kill drowning people if attacked  
Kuwait? Syria?  
Iranian mullahs  
Abu Ghraib and  
kill it (?)  
are not anti-US —  
only ones in ME

Ch 7 may wish  
to interview  
you at the  
break.

4-5-7

Can a president be prevented from  
luring us into a disastrous, aggressive,  
unconstitutional war (Iran)

that AIPAC wants? (media  
Congress  
donors)

Could he be impeached for it?

(or, for a set of foreign policy?  
on Korea, Vietnam, Iraq)

Would he "lose Congress"? Fighting?

Would he lose support of  
Dems?

Dem leaders?

Dem conservatives?

NYT? WP? Networks?

(Fan use of axes, after Iran response?)

Draft?

(Would 2nd amendment apply in 2008?)

(no change)

(Hagedorn attacked Israel, by

(after big attack!)

Did that make Hg. our enemy?

— Can we/Congress/conservatives end/withdraw  
altogether from a war that if AIPAC  
didn't want us to?

[us. M/H/H/Willy: We want aim to achieve the goals  
without US occupation, (concessions/agreements /ON...)]

Potential

4-5-7

To attack a few wanted by

Israel /

AIPAC?

(NHK "didn't  
know"; they want  
pro-threat)

Turky? (Does the lobby  
back up with AIPAC?)

Sunnis? (Sandis...)

Christian Zionists?  
Evangelicals?

(Can Christians take on Republicans?!!)

Oil corps? (No - Phyllis Bennis)

USAID? Navy? (Poe?)

Can AIPAC be censored?

By funs?

(I'm an American

Ethnically

In ethnic background,

Russia Jewish, not

pride of it.

anti-Semitic? about

anti-AIPAC, yes

Cintron: want anti

Iran attack;

stop voting over (J Cintron signs)

use of over other than

not just Biden;

for Type I Det...

Poe, Shultz, (from: N)

stop favoring

"good policy"

(not, "security")

not true this "transcendence

oppose all policy."

and TR: Merrill Wallace' letters